

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/073,426	02/11/2002	Cory Watkins	1552-CA-1	3969	
37974 7	7590 05/11/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
DICKE BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC ATTN: CHRISTOPHER MCLAUGHLIN			РНАМ,	PHAM, HOA Q	
100 SOUTH FIFTH STREET, SUITE 2250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	IS, MN 55402		2877		
			DATE MAILED: 05/11/200	DATE MAIL FD: 05/11/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				A·H		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	· · -	10/073,426	WATKINS ET AL.			
Of	fice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Hoa Q. Pham	2877			
The I Period for Repl	MAILING DATE of this communication a y	appears on the cover sheet w	with the correspondence address			
THE MAILIN - Extensions of the after SIX (6) M - If the period for the period for Failure to reply Any reply rece	NED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REFIGORATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ime may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior within the set or extended period for reply will, by statived by the Office later than three months after the material adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a septy within the statutory minimum of the od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC tute, cause the application to become a	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communicated the mailing date of this communicated.	ation.		
Status						
1) Respo	onsive to communication(s) filed on 28	February 2005.				
2a)∐ This a	ction is FINAL . 2b)⊠ TI	his action is non-final.				
•	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
closed	I in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of	Claims					
4)⊠ Claim	(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application	on.				
•	the above claim(s) is/are withd	rawn from consideration.				
·	(s) is/are allowed.					
	(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.					
•	(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim	(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.				
Application Pa	pers					
9)∐ The sp	ecification is objected to by the Exami	iner.				
10)☐ The dr	awing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ a	ccepted or b) objected to	o by the Examiner.			
Applica	ant may not request that any objection to t	he drawing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
•	ement drawing sheet(s) including the corr					
11)∐ The oa	th or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form PTO-152	2.		
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)∏ All	wledgment is made of a claim for forei b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority docume		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
	Certified copies of the priority docume		Application No.			
	Copies of the certified copies of the p	•		•		
_	application from the International Bure	•	•			
* See the	attached detailed Office action for a l	ist of the certified copies no	ot received.			
Attachment/s\						
Attachment(s)	erences Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	v Summary (PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Dra	ftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No	o(s)/Mail Date			
	isclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Mail Date	08) 5) Notice of 6) Other: _	f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/073,426 Page 2

Art Unit: 2877

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- a. The new added limitation "... repeated passes of one of the light source and the substrate relative to the other of the light source and the substrate" in claim 1 is not vague and indefinite because it not clear what applicant is trying to claim. Should it be changed to -- repeated passes the light source at different optical elevations relative to the substrate --?
- b. claims 2-7 depend on claim 1, therefore inherent the deficiencies of the claim1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1-2, 8-9, 16 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishihara (5,737,084).

Application/Control Number: 10/073,426

Art Unit: 2877

Regarding claims 1, 8 and 16, Ishihara discloses a confocal imaging system comprises a light source (6) (figures 2, 5, 10), a non-laser confocal sensor (9), wherein the confocal imaging system is adapted to rapidly determining heights of projections on a substrate based upon light intensities identified during a plurality passes, wherein the confocal sensor is stationary relative to the light source during pass (see figures 2, 5, 10, 11, 12 and column 2, line 49 through column 3, line 10).

Regarding claims 2 and 9; see column 2, lines 63-64 for a CCD camera.

Regarding claims 8 and 21, see column 2, line 50, for a white light source.

Regarding claim 21, there is no Nipkow disk in the system of Ishihara.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 3-7, 10-15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishihara in view of McCarthy et al (4,802,748) (of record).

Regarding claims 3, 4, 10-11, 14, and 18; Ishihara discloses all the features of claim 5 except that the beam splitter is a pellicle beam splitter. However, such a feature is known in the art as taught by McCarthy et al. McCarthy et al, from the same field of endeavor, discloses a confocal scanning microscope in which the pellicle beam splitter is used (col. 3, lines 43-45). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

Application/Control Number: 10/073,426 Page 4

Art Unit: 2877

the art at the time the invention was made to replace the beam splitter (2) of Ishihara by a pellicle beam splitter as taught by McCarthy et al because the pellicle beam splitter is extremely thin so as not to double the image or introduce astigmatism as suggested by McCarthy (column 3, lines 43-45).

Regarding claims 5, 6, 7, 12-14, and 18; Ishihara does not explicitly teach the use of plural lenses in the object imaging system and the camera system; however, such use of plural lenses in each of imaging system is known to one skilled in the art for the purpose of proving means for focusing and/or varying the magnification. Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the system provided by Ishihara in an inspection system having objective system and camera system with plural lenses for the purpose of providing means for adjusting the focus and/or magnification of the whole inspection system.

Regarding claims 15 and 19, see column 2, line 50 and column 9, lines 46-49 for the use of white light source.

- 7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Watkins et al (6,731,383) discloses a confocal 3D inspection system.

Art Unit: 2877

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoa Q. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-2426. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM to 6 PM, Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory J. Toatley, Jr. can be reached on (571) 272-2800 ext. 77. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hoa Q. Pham Primary Examiner Art Unit 2877

HP May 10, 2005